GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
LOK SABHA

STARRED QUESTION NO:106
ANSWERED ON:02.03.2000
IMPLEMENTATION OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES
SURESH KODIKUNNIL

Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether the government have issued fresh guidelines to the State Governments for effective implementation and proper monitoring of various Rural Development Programmes ? ;

(b) if so, the details thereof ? ; and

(c) the details of findings of various impact assesment studies and concurrent evaluation ?

Answer

MINISTER OF STATE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI SUNDAR LAL PATWA)

(a) to (c) : A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement referred to in parts (a) to (c) of Lok Sabha Starred Question No.106 for reply on 2.03.2000

(a) & (b) : The guidelines for various programmes, including the guidelines issued during the year, 1999-2000 for the restructured programmes such as Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana, Employment Assurance Scheme and Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana, contained provisions for implementation, monitoring and evaluation. These are in the nature of prescription of periodic reports; coordination mechanism for Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana in the form of Block/District/State-level SGSY Committees; and schedules for inspection of works. In addition, this Ministry has also issued guidelines for constitution of Vigilance and Monitoring Committees at the State, District and Block levels, which meet periodically to review the implementation of different programmes.

(c) During the last five years, the Ministry has undertaken concurrent evaluation (CE) of the Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP), the Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) and the Million Wells Scheme (MWS) and has also conducted Nine Impact Assesment Studies. While the reports of CE of the IAY and the MWS are being finalised, the major findings of CE of the IRDP and the Impact Assesment Studies are contained in the Annexure.

Annexure

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 106 DUE FOR REPLY ON 2.3.2000.

Major findings of Concurrent Evaluation of Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) conducted during 1995-96

1. 72.80% beneficiaries (old and new both) in the primary sector, 78.81% in the secondary sector and 71.82% in the tertiary sector reported the assistance (subsidy plus loan) for purchase of assets as adequate.

2. The average net income of old beneficiaries from IRDP assets was reported to be Rs. 2498/- for all sectors taken together and was Rs. 3328/- for tertiary sector and Rs. 1903/- for primary sector.

3. 94.47% of the old beneficiaries who were productively using the assets reported that their quality was very good or fair.

4. 87.38% of the new beneficiaries reported the asset to be in productive use.

5. 84.96% of old beneficiaries crossed earlier poverty line of Rs. 6400/- while 46.34% of them crossed the revised poverty line of Rs. 11000/-.

6. 82.85% of SC old beneficiaries crossed earlier poverty line of Rs. 6400/-while 39.12% of them crossed the revised poverty line of Rs. 11000/-.

7. 83.06% of ST old beneficiaries crossed earlier poverty line of Rs. 6400/- while 33.65% of them crossed the revised poverty line of Rs. 11000/-.

8. About 40% of the households identified below poverty line in the BPL survey are from Scheduled Castes (SC) (22.35%) and Scheduled Tribes (ST) (17.37%) categories.

9 . Only 26.36% of the beneficiaries were selected by Gram Sabha whereas 55.74% of thebeneficiaries were selected by village/block officials.

10. 21.64% of old and new families reported that school age going children working to support the family.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDIES:

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDIES ARE GIVEN BELOW

1. Majority of the recipient of assistance for creating assets was earning viable income from the scheme.

2. Increment in employment days and income has resulted in better quantity of meal.

3. Shortage of personnel and resources is a major hurdle in implementation of programmes.

4. The target group enjoys better standard of living in the villages which indicates that impact of these programmes has been favourable in the past in raising the standard of living of the poor people.

5. Transparency in selection of beneficiaries, maintenance of records, and maintenance of databases needs improvement.

6 . Despite many problems, the poverty alleviation programmes had definitely made an impact. All stakeholders had reported that although piecemeal, the villages had certainly progressed in the past three years, especially due to the creation of community assets like roads, water points, essential buildings like the school, etc. There were reports of increasing affordability for basic necessities and other household expenses. In many cases, the additional income had been diverted to the education of the children. Beneficiaries from the MWS had reported increasing productivity of crops and a rise in agricultural income.

7 Under NOAPS most of the beneficiaries received benefits.43 percent of the beneficiaries were women. 40 percent of the beneficiaries under the scheme said that the pension is not paid regularly.

8. There is a need to have professional and realistic approach for identification of viable projects, be it for the beneficiaries or for the village.

9. Beneficiaries specially under IRDP and DWCRA find it very difficult to market the products manufactured by them. This is due to lack of quality of the product being manufactured. There is need to adopt appropriate technology to suit rural entrepreneurs and create awareness among the beneficiaries regarding the importance of maintaining the quality.

10. Most of the projects identified under the various programmes suffer manly due to unscientific way of fixing the project cost.